

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. With this amendment, claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the interview that was held on November 27, 2006. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections were discussed. No agreement was reached.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph: Claims 1-24

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing comply with the written description requirement. Additionally, the Examiner rejected the claims under the same reasons.

Examiner rejected claims 1-24 as follows:

Amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 recites "receiving, within said processor card ***from an application***, a hardware reset request that requests said processor card to reset said second resource card" (emphasis added). After a careful review of the specification, the Examiner has determined that the specification does not describe receiving a hardware reset request in a processor card ***from an application*** (emphasis added). Therefore, the application contains new matter. Applicant's remarks have not pointed to a specific part of the specification that provides support for the limitation above. The specification describes receiving hardware reset requests and software communication requests (Figure 4), but does not describe where the hardware reset requests are received from. In the specification, Service Processor Card (Item 300) has a queue (Item 322) that holds software communication requests and hardware reset requests. The software communication requests are described as being generated by a software process (Specification; Page 12 Lines 19-25). However, it is not described in the specification where the hardware reset request is generated from.

Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006, pp. 3-4

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 17 to delete the phrase "from an application" from the claims. Applicants believe the rejection of claims 1-24 has been overcome by the amendment of the claims and should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph: Claims 1-24

The examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated:

As per claims 1-24, independent claim 1, 9, and 17 contradict the specification. The independent claims recite, "receiving, within said processor card from an application, a hardware reset request that requests said processor card to reset said second resource card," which is not supported by the specification (See new matter rejection above). Therefore, it is not clear as to what generates the hardware reset request.

The Examiner has interpreted the hardware reset request to be received by the processor card and not limited as to where it is generated, as per the specification.

Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006, pp. 4-5

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 17 to delete the phrase "from an application" from the claims. Applicants believe the rejection of claims 1-24 has been overcome by the amendment of the claims and should be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

This amendment is proper for entry because it removes issues for appeal.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants